APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,423	02/11/2004	Suryanarayana Murthy Gorty	ID-487 (80224)	2891

89137   7590   06/24/2009
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath & Gilchrist- RIM
255 S. Orange Avenue
Suite 1401
Orlando, FL 32801

EXAMINER
KEEFER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 May 2009_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _56-69_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _56-69_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the RCE filed 5/18/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2.   Claims 56-58, 60-61, and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 20010029524), hereafter Smith in view of Temple ("The Complete Idiot's Guide to Microsoft Outlook 2000", page 16) and further in view of Arnold et al. (US 6965918), hereafter Arnold.

Regarding claim 56, Smith discloses:

A system for providing configuration data for remotely accessing electronic mail (email) on a plurality of source mailboxes, the system comprising:

a user system comprising a processor; at least one email client using said processor for accessing the plurality of source mailboxes, and a mailbox configuration data source having configuration parameters stored therein for configuring access to the plurality of source mailboxes from said at least one email client; (fig. 1, 100 contains mailbox configuration data, 140 and 142 also 150 and 152.)

a web service for allowing said user system to access the plurality of source mailboxes; and (email applications 170 172)

a configuration module for retrieving from said mailbox configuration data source, without user intervention, respective configuration parameters for at least one

source mailbox, and for configuring said web service also without user

intervention; said configuration module comprising an import module having at

least one mailbox import agent corresponding to said at least one email client for

retrieving, without user intervention, configuration parameters from said mailbox

configuration data source and generating respective configuration data objects

for each respective one of the at least one source mailbox. (module 120, which

receives configuration information 140, 142, 150, and 152 and then uses that

information to access the email accounts using the applications 170 and 172.

module 120 acts as the configuration module and works with the web service

170-172, electronic mailbox(es) 170-172 or 150-152, and user device 190. the

parameters used by the configuration module 120 (i.e. items 140-142) include

configuration parameters that are decided by the email provider, see paragraph

25. Further, the user is not required to give any parameters to module 120,

because the user has previously entered them in data 140-142 and are retrieved

by module 120 without the user supplying them to the module directly.)

Smith discloses all the limitations of claim 56 except for retrieving information

from an email client without user intervention.

The general concept of retrieving email settings from an email client without user

intervention is well known in the art as taught by Temple which teaches how an

email program can import settings from other previously configured email

programs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Smith and the general concept of retrieving email settings from an email client without user intervention as taught by Temple in order to eliminate user error when re-entering email account settings.

Smith and Temple teach all the limitations of claim 56 except for the configuration module having at least a portion remote from said user system.

The general concept of having some part of the configuration system remote from a user system is well known in the art as taught by Arnold. (See Fig. 2, Mail registration database 108, Fig. 7, mail registration database 108)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Smith and Temple with the general concept of having some part of the configuration system remote from a user system as taught by Arnold in order to allow the user more flexible access to email, rather than only allowing cell phone usage.

Regarding **claim 57**, Smith discloses:

wherein a web service comprises an internet service provider (ISP) that uses configuration data for accessing electronic mail from another internet service provider. (Fig. 1, universal mail application 100 provides an internet service that allows user 190 to access email at other mail service providers)

Regarding **claim 58**, Smith discloses:

wherein a mailbox comprises an interface that uses configuration data on-the-fly

for accessing an electronic mailbox. ([0037] discloses using configuration data on the

fly)

Regarding **claim 60**, Smith discloses:

wherein said user system comprises a web browser or email client. (system 100

is an email client, because it is being used to access and deliver email)

Regarding **claim 61**, Smith discloses:

wherein said user system comprises a personal computer or mobile

communications device. (system 100 is a personal computer)

Claims 64-66 recite substantially the same limitations as the claims rejected

above, and thus are rejected for similar reasoning.

3.   Claims 59, 62-63, and 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Smith, Temple, and Arnold as applied to claims 56 and 64 above and

further in view of DeBusk et al. (US 2001/0016821), hereafter DeBusk.

Smith, Temple, and Arnold teach all the limitations of claims 59, 62-63, and 67-

69 except for the use of component object modules, distributed object modules, and

ActiveX controls.

The general concept of implementing a configuration module as an ActiveX

component object module (i.e. a distributed object module) is well known in the art as

taught by Debusk. ([0064] teaches the use of ActiveX components in a system which

gathers medical information about patients.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Smith, Temple, and Arnold with the general concept of implementing

a configuration module as an ActiveX component object module (i.e. a distributed object

module) as taught by Debusk in order to provide encapsulated reusable functionality.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 56-69 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is

(571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday

9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 6/20/2009

/DUSTIN NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454